



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,194	11/27/2000	Nicolae Marius Busuioc	36-1367	7759

23117 7590 01/05/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/701,194

Applicant(s)

BUSUIOC, NICOLAE MARIUS

Examiner

Benjamin R. Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-15, 17 and 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-15, 17 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 7-15, 17, 27-31 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 1-6, 16, 18-26 are cancelled.

Claim 30 is amended.

Foreign Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted on August 27, 2000 under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file. Attention is directed to the fact that the date for which foreign priority is claimed is not the date of the filed application acknowledged in the oath or declaration. The priority date of 6/23/98 is given priority.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment filed 11/3/05, have been fully considered but are not persuasive. See Remarks below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the request" in part (c) of the first claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claims 7-11, 17, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No 6,085,186 by Christianson et al (referenced as "Chris").

Regarding claim 7, a distributed platform for coordinating user access to information provided by content service providers (Chris: col. 2, lines 39-49; content service providers=sources), the platform comprising:

- (a) a user interface (Chris: col. 4, lines 38, 44-45);
- (b) a first advertising board for advertising services of information brokers (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-47; col. 7, lines 35-46; wrapper DB; the advertising board is the database of sources which is ranked and queried);
- (c) a first searching agent for searching the first advertising board for services based on the request from the user (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-47; ranks and selects relevant sources);
- (d) a second advertising board for advertising the services of information content suppliers (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-48; the source itself);
- (e) a second searching agent for searching the second advertising board for available services based on results of the search of the first advertising board and the request from the user (Chris: col. 7, lines 46-55; second agent=aggregation engine that formats the query for the sources and receives responses based on the first query), and
- (f) means for providing the results of the search of the second advertising board from the second advertising board to the first advertising board, and transferring the results from the first advertising board to the user interface through the first searching agent (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-50; col. 7, lines 52-56).

Regarding claim 8, a distributed platform as in claim 7, wherein the first and second advertising boards are distributed (Chris: Fig. 3 and col. 11, lines 11-17).

Regarding claim 9, a distributed platform as in claim 7, wherein a plurality of first and second advertising boards are provided each of which advertises the services available in a particular market (Chris: col. 7, lines 65- col. 8 line 20; relevant sources and conceptual class).

Regarding claim 10, a distributed platform as in claim 7, wherein means are provided for interrogating the user to determine specific preferences (Chris: col. 4, lines 31-36; Fig. 2B; col. 7, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 11, a distributed platform as in claim 10, wherein the specific preferences comprise where and/or how and/or when the information found by the second searching agent, is to be communicated to the user (Chris: col. 6, lines 17-39; where is the URL; Fig. 2A and 2B).

Regarding claim 17, a distributed platform for coordinating user access to information provided by content service provider (Chris: col. 2, lines 39-49), the platform comprising:

- (a) a user interface for receiving a request from a user (Chris: col. 4, lines 38, 44-45);
- (b) a content service provider advertising board for advertising services of content service providers (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-48; the sources themselves);
- (c) a first searching agent for searching the content service provider advertising board for services, based on the request from the user (Chris: col. 7, lines 46-55; second agent=aggregation engine that formats the query for the sources and receives responses based on the first query);
- (d) means for providing the results of the search of the content service provider advertising board to the user (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-50);
- (e) a broker advertising board for advertising the services of brokers that act as intermediaries between the content service provider and the user (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-47; col. 7, lines 35-46; wrapper DB); and
- (f) a second searching agent for searching the broker advertising board for available services based on the request from the user (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-47; selects relevant sources),

wherein the second searching agent identifies a suitable broker based on the request from the user and the first searching agent is associated with that identified broker so that the first searching agent searches the content service provider advertising board for services based on the identified broker as well as the request from the user (Chris: col. 7, lines 65- col. 8, line 20).

Regarding claim 30, a distributed platform for processing a user request for information (Chris: col. 2, lines 39-49), the platform comprising:

- (a) a user interface for receiving a user request for information (Chris: col. 4, lines 38, 44-45);
- (b) a service agent board for advertising services of a plurality of service agents (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-47; col. 7, lines 35-46; wrapper DB);
- (c) a customer agent for searching the service agent board and selecting at least one of service agent from the plurality of service agents based on the received user request (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-47; selects relevant sources); and
- (d) a customer supplier agent board for advertising the services of information content suppliers (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-48; the sources themselves);

wherein the at least one selected service agent searches for and selects at least one information content provider from the customer supplier agent board, and the at least one selected information content provider provides information based on the received user request to the at least one selected service agent which in turn provides the information to the customer agent (Chris: col. 7, lines 46-55; second agent=aggregation engine that formats the query for the sources and receives responses based on the first query).

Regarding claim 31, a distributed platform for co-coordinating user access to information provided by content service providers (Chris: col. 2, lines 39-49), the, the platform comprising:

- (a) a user interface for receiving a request from a user (Chris: col. 4, lines 38, 44-45);
- (b) a first advertising board for advertising services of information brokers (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-47; col. 7, lines 35-46; wrapper DB);

(c) a first searching agent for searching the first advertising board and selecting a particular information broker based on the request from the user (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-47; selects relevant sources);

(d) a second advertising board for advertising the services of information content suppliers (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-48; the source itself);

(e) a second searching agent for searching the second advertising board based on the request from the user, the second searching agent being selected by the selected information broker (Chris: col. 7, lines 46-55; second agent=aggregation engine that formats the query for the sources and receives responses based on the first query);

wherein the results of the search of the second advertising board are provided from the second searching agent to the first searching agent, and then transferred from the first searching agent to the user interface (Chris: col. 4, lines 46-50).

Claims 12-15, 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,085,186 by Christianson et al (referenced as "Chris") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,482 by Burt et al.

Regarding claim 12,

The Chris reference teaches a distributed platform as in claim 7 involving finance (col. 6, line 22-34).

The Chris reference does not explicitly state a banking agent.

The Burt reference teaches a banking agent is provided for monitoring all financial transactions that take place as a result of the request from the user, between the information brokers and the information content suppliers (Burt: col. 5, lines 1-10, lines 19-26).

The Burt reference further teaches the invention facilitates the supplying of services offered by a network while allowing for the rapid introduction of new technology and new service applications (Burt: col. 2, lines 44-54).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the distributed platform as taught by Chris while employing a banking agent as taught by Burt in order to allow the supplying of services offered by a network while allowing

for the rapid introduction of new technology and new service applications (Burt: col. 2, lines 44-54).

Claims 27-29, 13-15 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set forth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Chris and Burt et al.

Regarding claim 27, a distributed platform as in claim 12 in which the first searching agent monitors the user interface for an acceptance message which is transferred to the content supplier selected from the second advertising board by way of the information broker selected from the first advertising board (Burt: col. 6, lines 1-29; message).

Regarding claim 28, a distributed platform as in claim 27 in which the content supplier forwards transaction details to the banking agent, said details identifying the information broker and the information broker forwards additional transaction details to the banking agent to cause a billing agent to bill the requesting user (Burt: col. 5, lines 19-26).

Regarding claim 29, a distributed platform as in claim 27 in which the content supplier causes launch of an execution agent to effect delivery of the selected service to the requesting user (Burt: col. 6, lines 41-43).

Regarding claim 13, a distributed platform as in claim 12, wherein each user has an account that is monitored by the banking agent and is up-dated as soon as response to a request for information is accepted for delivery to the user (Burt: col. 5, lines 19-26; col. 6, lines 14-22).

Regarding claim 14, a distributed platform as in claim 1, wherein a marketing agent is provided for setting up the first and second advertising boards and subsequent boards introduced onto the platform (Burt: col. 7, lines 9-21; col. 9, lines 4-9).

Regarding claim 15, a distributed platform as in claim 14, wherein the marketing agent arranges the boards according to the type of services being marketed thereon (Chris: col. 14, lines 42-65).

REMARKS

Applicant has argued the reference does not teach the claimed inventions and has made an amendment to claim 30.

The Applicant Argues:

The Christianson reference fails to disclose the features of claim 1.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Examiner will clarify and define the claim components to the prior art of record.

The first advertising board is the query router and wrapper database. As defined in col. 7, lines 35-46, the router and database contain data, 'advertising' the sources capabilities and conceptual classes (col. 8, lines 11-16). The sources are listed in the database and are ranked based upon the users query or request for the most relevant features. The wrapper database is then queried and returns descriptions of the sources and their requirements like what languages it communicates in (col. 9, lines 40-64). This is the first advertising board. The board contains information about the services of the brokers and requirements (col. 7, lines 38-45). The first search is the searching for N most relevant sources based on the users query and then providing the wrapper information about the resultant sources. These are based on the request from the user. The point is to find relevant sources and filter out irrelevant information (col. 7, lines 65-col. 9, line 16). The user's query to the router and wrapper components to find N sites with the most pertinent information while avoiding information not related to the query.

The second advertising board is the relevant information sources themselves. The services and information of each content provider are present and thus advertise their 'services of the information content' as suppliers. The second searching agent is the aggregation engine that searches the sources based on the results of the first search and the request from the user. The user query has been processed and 50 relevant sources and their respective requirements are now used by the aggregation engine to search for the services. The results are received, understood and extracted based on the results from the first query to the first board and then passed and displayed to the user.

The prior art reads openly on the claim language because of the breadth of the limitations is broad. The examiner suggests applicant should clearly define how an advertising board or customer agent supplier board is different from an information source. In the prior art a board could be a webpage. Advertising is interpreted to be 'make know' or 'announce' or 'publicize.' The claim limitation states announcing or making known the services of each source. The applicant should also define what 'a request' entails. By simply claiming just stating a request, it can be a request for anything, as the prior art reads it is a request for information. Defining the request as a query for service level agreements or services of a particular nature to provide with details those services would aid in defining applicant's invention. Information brokers could be further defined as well by detailing whether they provide content, services, or information on a contractual basis.

Conclusion


Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155
brb


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER